OVERVIEW

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, Region III

Chesapeake Bay Program Office

Fiscal Year 2006 Request for Proposals (RFP) for State Tributary Strategy Implementation

Initial Announcement of EPA-R3CBP-05-04

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number: 66.466

Important Dates:

August 22, 2005	Issuance of RFP
October 5, 2005	Proposal Submission Deadline (see Section IV for more information)
February 15, 2006	Approximate date for EPA to notify applicants of results
March 15, 2006	Approximate date for Applicant to submit federal grant application Processing of grant typically takes 60 days
May 15, 2006	Approximate date for grant award

Executive Summary

Under Section 117(d) of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection (EPA) has the authority to issue assistance agreements (grant or cooperative agreements), and under Section 117(c) interagency agreements to other Federal Agencies, for the purposes of protecting and restoring the Chesapeake Bay's ecosystem. Section 117(d) and Section117(c) allows, the following activities as well as others: implementation of state tributaries in support of the Program's efforts to reduce nutrients and sediments entering the Bay and to improve water quality. The Tasks listed in Section I and Appendix C are eligible for funding under Section 117(d) and (c).

*The Chesapeake Bay Program plans to award grant or cooperative agreements and/or interagency agreements under this RFP. Total funding available is approximately **$1,500,000**. The award(s) will depend on individual proposal costs, the final aggregate amount of federal funding for proposals, and the total amount of federal funding available. Proposals must address a specific Task included in Section I and Appendix C of this announcement. Should*

additional funding become available for awards under this announcement within 6 months of the initial award selection decision, the Agency may award additional assistance agreements based on this announcement in accordance with the final selection process and agency policy, without further notice or competition.

Eligible applicants who may submit proposals in response to this announcement are any nonprofit organization, state or local government agency, interstate agency, college or university or federal agency. If an organization submits a proposal for an assistance agreement (grant or cooperative agreement), it must provide a minimum of five (5) percent of the total cost of the project as the non-federal share. If a federal agency submits a proposal (interagency agreement), they must provide an Agency share.

This RFP is expected to result in the awards of grant or cooperative agreements and/or interagency agreements. The expected project and budget period for each Task is expected to be a minimum of one year. Refer to Appendix C for expected project period for each task.

The EPA will consider all proposals which are postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service, hand delivered or include official delivery service documentation indicating EPA acceptance from a delivery service on or before 5:00pm EST on ***October 5, 2005.*** *Any proposals postmarked, hand delivered or received by EPA after the due date will not be considered for funding. No proposals will be accepted by facsimile machine submission. Proposals should be addressed to:*

Kim Scalia
US EPA - 3CB00
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA
scalia.kim@epa.gov

Administrative and Technical questions should be addressed to:

Danielle Algazi
RE: ***EPA-R3CBP-05-04***
US EPA – 3CB00
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA
Algazi.Danielle@epa.gov
Please Reference RFP ***EPA-R3CBP-05-04***

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Fiscal Year 2006 Request for Proposals (RFP) for
State Tributary Strategy Implementation

EPA-R3CBP-05-04

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 66.466

FULL TEXT ANNOUNCEMENT

Section I: Funding Opportunity Description

A. **About the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP):** The Chesapeake Bay is North America's largest and most biologically diverse estuary. The Bay is a resource of extraordinary productivity, worthy of the highest levels of protection and restoration. Accordingly, in 1983 the states of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, the Chesapeake Bay Commission, and the EPA signed an agreement that established the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership to protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem.

B. ***Chesapeake 2000:*** On June 28, 2000, the Bay Program's governing Executive Council signed a new agreement, known as Chesapeake 2000: A Watershed Partnership. Chesapeake 2000 is one of the most aggressive and comprehensive watershed restoration plans ever developed. The agreement is the result of a comprehensive three-year stakeholder-driven process involving more than 300 scientists, resource managers, policymakers and citizens from all parts of the Bay watershed. The new agreement consolidated prior commitments and established new goals and deadlines for protecting and restoring the Bay's living resources, water quality, and vital habitats, promoting sound land use, and engaging communities beyond 2000.

C. **Proposals**: The specific Tasks for which proposals are requested under this announcement and are listed in greater detail in Appendix C of this announcement are as follows: 1) Local Implementation of Tributary Strategies Through Changes in Local Codes and Ordinances; 2) Statistical and Hydrologic Analysis of Sediment Data; 3) Assessing Nutrient Reductions from Precision Agriculture and Reduced Rate Precision Agriculture: 4) Estimating the Proportion of Total Sediment and Nutrient Loads Contributed by Failing (eroded) Riverbanks in Rural Lands; 5) Calculate the Water Quality Co0efficiency of Urban Trees; 6) Chesapeake Club Outreach Initiative; 7) 2007 Biannual Chesapeake Bay Education Summit; 8) Communications Associate (Media Relations); 9) Sediment Trend Analysis of the Elizabeth River; 10) Financing Chesapeake Bay Restoration; 11) Coordinating the Nutrient Subcommittee; 12) Develop Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment Reduction Efficiencies for Conservation Practices found in Tributary Strategies.

These Tasks were designed to help the Chesapeake Bay Program meet the *Chesapeake 2000* goals and all other directives and statements signed by the Executive Council. The primary goals

of the Bay Program in this regard are to foster implementation of state tributary strategies in support of the Program's efforts to reduce nutrients and sediments entering the Bay and to improve water quality.

If your organization or federal agency has an interest in these topics, has the skills to accomplish one or more of these Tasks, and if you are eligible to receive a Federal assistance agreement and/or interagency agreement, we encourage you to submit a proposal. You may submit proposals for as many or as few of the Tasks as you choose. Each Task requires a separate proposal that will be evaluated based on the relevant criteria referenced in Section V and Appendix C. If you are making a multi year proposal, the proposal should have a work plan and budget for the first year and an estimated budget and outcomes for future years. Refer to Appendix C for the expected project period for each task.

D. **Authorizing Statutes and Regulations**: Grants or cooperative agreements made as a result of this announcement will be awarded under the authority of the Clean Water Act, Section 117(d) and will be administered under the Federal grant regulations found at 40 CFR Parts 30 and 31, as applicable. Interagency agreement awards made to other Federal Agencies will be made under the authority of the Clean Water Act, Section 117(c).

F. **Environmental Results**: EPA Order 5700.7 requires that all assistance agreements (grants or cooperative agreements) be aligned with EPA's strategic goals and objectives and that assistance agreements result in real, measurable, results. Under this order, effective January 1, 2005, EPA requires assistance programs to focus not only on outputs (i.e., the activities and/or associated work products performed or conducted by an assistance agreement recipient during the funding period) but also on outcomes (i.e., the results, effects, or consequences of a recipient's activities). As a result of this order, EPA will negotiate outcomes and outputs with the selected grantee(s). Examples of expected outcomes and outputs for grants, cooperative agreements and interagency agreements (IAGs) to be awarded under this announcement are listed under each Task in Appendix C.

The Agency's Strategic Plan/Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Linkage
The overall goal of these assistance agreements are to protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay through continued technical support and outreach necessary to address water quality restoration goals and maintain public awareness of Bay restoration. This goal supports the Agency's Strategic Goal #4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems, Objective 4.3 Ecosystem, Sub-objective 4.3.4 Improve Aquatic Health of the Chesapeake Bay. The projects funded under this announcement must be able to be linked to this strategic goal.

Section II: Award Information

A. **Funding Amount**: Awards made under this RFP support the Chesapeake Bay Program water quality improvements through nutrient and sediment reduction activities. Grants or cooperative agreements awarded will be funded under Section 117(d) and under Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number 66.466 Chesapeake Bay Program**.** Interagency

agreement awards made to other Federal Agencies will be made under the authority of the Clean Water Act, Section 117(c). Total funding expected to be available under this announcement is approximately ***$1,500,000***. Refer to Appendix C for funding ranges for each Task. EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals and make no awards under this announcement.

B. **Award Type**: EPA has determined that an assistance agreement (grant or cooperative agreement) or interagency agreement is the appropriate funding vehicle for these projects. The Chesapeake Bay Program Office is expected to award one or more grant or cooperative agreement(s) and/or interagency agreement(s) per task under this RFP. Cooperative agreements are used under circumstances where substantial involvement is anticipated between the EPA and the recipient during performance of the activity. Typically federal involvement would be in the form of participation with other Chesapeake Bay Program partners and stakeholders in an advisory capacity to the grantee. This participation is expected to include involvement through CBP's subcommittees (on which EPA also participates to ensure that all the recommendations for communications and outreach work support all the Bay Partners). All work conducted is to support the efforts to restore the Bay (and its living resources).

C. **Expected Project Period:** Fiscal Year 2006 federal funding will be available for the awards for these tasks. The expected project and budget period for each Task is expected to be a minimum of one year. The start date will depend on when the full application is submitted, but will generally be 60-90 days after submission. Multi-year proposals should have a work plan and budget for the duration of the project years. No commitment of funding can be made for future fiscal years. See Appendix C for expected project periods for each task.

Section III: Eligibility Information

A. **Eligible Applicants**: Any nonprofit organization, Federal, state or local government agency, interstate agency, or college or university is eligible to submit proposals in response to this RFP. EPA will consider all proposals received by the closing date identified in **Section IV C.** For-profit organizations are not eligible to submit proposals in response to this RFP.

B. **Cost Share or Matching Requirements**: As stated in the U.S. EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance, if an organization submits a proposal for a grant or cooperative agreement, it must provide a minimum of five (5) percent of the total cost of the project as the non-federal share in order to receive an award. Cost share may be in the form of cash or in-kind contribution. If a Federal agency submits a proposal (interagency agreement), they must provide an Agency share.

C. **Other Eligibility Requirements**: The EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office will screen proposals to ensure they meet all requirements of this announcement (e.g., that the submitting organization is eligible, that the proposal submission requirements listed in sections IV. B. and V of this announcement have been met in terms of length, format and required elements, etc.). Proposals must address one of the Tasks listed in Appendix C of this announcement. You may submit proposals for as many or as few of the Tasks as you choose. Each Task requires a

separate proposal. Proposals from ineligible entities and /or proposals that do not address a specific task in Appendix C will not be considered. In addition, if a proposal is found to be not in substantial compliance with the proposal submission requirements listed in Section 1V. B and V, or if the applicant is ineligible for Federal funding/grant, the proposal will be returned to the applicant without further consideration.

Section IV: Application and Submission Information

A. **Federal Application**: Do not submit a full federal grant application in response to this RFP. If your proposal is selected for funding, a federal project officer will request an application from you, negotiate the workplan and budget and oversee the process of awarding the assistance agreement (grant or cooperative agreement). There is no federal application form for interagency agreements, however, a federal project officer will work with staff from the other federal agency to negotiate the workplan and budget and oversee the process of awarding the interagency agreement.

B. **Content and Form of Proposal Submission**

Proposal Elements: You may submit proposals for as many or as few of the Tasks as you choose. Each Task requires a separate proposal that will be evaluated based on the relevant criteria referenced in Section V and Appendix C. You must submit two documents for each task you are applying for: a one-page proposal summary (see Appendix A) and an expanded proposal of up to twelve pages in length (See Appendix B) by date specified in Section IV C. below. The formats for these proposals are contained in Appendices A and B of this announcement. Review the directions for the preparation of each proposal carefully. Proposals that are not prepared in accordance with the requirements in Appendix A and B may not be considered for funding and will be returned to the applicant.

Length of One Page Summary, Appendix A: The one page proposal summary must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Appendix A or the proposal may be rejected. The one page proposal summary must be limited to one page and any additional pages will not be considered in the review.

Requirements for Appendix B: Expanded Proposal: The review criteria that applies to all proposals are listed in Section V:
Application Review Information and the criteria in Appendix C for specific tasks announcement must be addressed in the proposal. The expanded proposal shall not exceed twelve pages in length. Pages refer to one-side of a typed page. The proposal must be submitted on 8 '/2 x 11 paper. Note that the twelve pages must include all supporting materials, including resumes or curriculum vitae and letters of support. With the exception of documentation of non-profit status, if you submit more than twelve pages, the additional pages will be discarded and will not be considered in the review.

In evaluating an applicant under the programmatic capability evaluation criteria ranking factor in Section V, EPA will consider information provided by the applicant and may consider information from other sources including Agency files. Applicants will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate their capability and capacity to successfully carry out the proposed project for all of the evaluation criteria listed in Section V.

Confidential Business Information: In accordance with 40 CFR 2203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their application/proposal as confidential business information EPA will evaluate confidentiality claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark applications, proposals or portions of applications/proposals they claim as confidential. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 CFR 2.204(c)(2) prior to disclosure.

C. **Submission Dates and Times**: EPA will consider all submissions that are postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service on or before 5:00 EST **October 5, 2005**, or that are hand-delivered, or include official delivery service documentation indicating EPA reciept from a delivery service, on or before 5:00 EST on **October 5, ,2005.** All submissions postmarked or otherwise received after the deadlines specified above will not be considered for funding. No proposals will be accepted by facsimile machine submission.

D. **Intergovernmental Review**: Applicants selected for a grant or cooperative agreement must comply with the Intergovernmental Review Process and/or consultation provisions of Section 204, Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, if applicable, which are contained in 40 CFR Part 29. This program is eligible for coverage under Executive Order (EO) 12372, An Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs. An applicant should consult the office or official designated as the single point of contact in his or her state for more information on that state's required process for applying for assistance if the state has selected the program for review. Single Points of Contact can be found at http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html. Further information regarding this requirement will be provided if your proposal is selected for funding.

Note: This requirement does not apply to federal agencies selected for an interagency agreement.

E. **Funding Restrictions:**

Administrative Cap Worksheet: Under statutory authority, grantees applying for Chesapeake Bay Program assistance agreements (cooperative or grant agreement) must adhere to the requirement in the Clean Water Act, Section 117 (d)(4) - "Administrative Costs". This section requires a 10 percent cap for administrative costs. Information on how to calculate the 10 percent cap for administrative costs is located in an attachment of the "Grant Guidance: U.S. EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Grant Guidance" that can be found at http://www.epa.gov/chesapeake/grants/10_Admin_Cost_Cap_Worksheet.pdf under the "grants guidance" heading.

Note: This requirement does not apply to federal agencies selected for an interagency agreement.

Allowable Costs: EPA grant/Federal funds may only be used for the purposes set forth in the grant or cooperative agreement and/or interagency agreement and must be consistent with the statutory authority for the award. Assistance agreement funds may not be used for cost sharing for other Federal grants, lobbying, or intervention in Federal regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. In addition, Federal funds may not be used to sue the Federal government or any other government entity. All costs identified in the budget must conform to applicable Federal Cost Principles contained in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87 "Cost Principles for State, Local and Tribal Governments;" A-122 "Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations;" or A-21 "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions." Ineligible costs will be reduced from final grant award.

F. **Other Submission Requirements**: Please submit three complete, unbound copies of the proposal and an electronic copy of the complete proposal in either Word or WordPerfect (WP6, WP7, Word 97, and Excel 97 are acceptable) via email or disk. The hard copies of the proposal should be one-sided, if possible. The proposal must be mailed or delivered to:

Kim Scalia
US EPA - 3CB00
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
scalia.kim@epa.gov

Electronic copies should be emailed to:
Algazi.Danielle@epa.gov
RE: EPA-R3CBP-05-04

Section V: Application Review Information

A. **Evaluation Criteria:** After EPA reviews proposals for threshold eligibility purposes as described in Section III, the Chesapeake Bay Program will conduct a merit evaluation of each complete proposal from an eligible applicant. Reviews will normally involve teams of professionals from EPA and non-EPA organizations. All proposals, regardless of which task they relate to, will be reviewed against the criteria set forth in B. below. In addition, **the proposals for Tasks # 1,2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10 and 12** will be evaluated against the specific criteria that apply to those tasks as identified in Appendix C. The criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals will depend upon the task proposed for and whether any specific criteria apply to it, and the total points available under the evaluation will also depend upon which task is being proposed for and evaluated.

B. Evaluation Criteria that apply to all proposals:

1. Administrative, technical and scientific support experience: The extent to which the mission of your organization matches the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Program for this assistance agreement and how this will help you deliver effective administrative, technical and scientific support to the CBP. **(Maximum score 10 points)**

2. Task Implementation: The degree to which the applicant can implement the applied for task of this RFP as described in Appendix C**. (Maximum score: 20 points)**

3. Ecosystem Knowledge: The degree to which the applicant has knowledge of and direct experience with the technical and policy issues related to the restoration and protection of the Chesapeake Bay watershed, or other watershed, and the specific challenges and issues facing the Chesapeake Bay restoration. **(Maximum score: 10 points)**

4. Appropriate and Cost Effective Budget: To what degree is the proposal cost effective considering organizational overhead (indirect costs) and the applicant's ability to perform the duties within the budget range projected by the Chesapeake Bay Program. **(Maximum score: 15 points)**

5. Tracking and Measuring Environmental Results: To what degree does the proposal demonstrate the applicant's ability to track and measure progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes described in Appendix C for the respective task being proposed for. **(Maximum score: 20 points)**

6. Programmatic Capability Ranking Factor: Applicants will be evaluated based on their programmatic capability to successfully perform the proposed task(s) including their: (i) past performance in successfully completing federally and/or non-federally funded projects similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project, (ii) history of meeting reporting requirements on prior or current assistance agreements with federal and/or non-federal organizations and submitting acceptable final technical reports, (iii) organization experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the project, (iv) staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the project, and (v) the degree of fulfill the job requirements within their own organization as opposed to the use of significant subcontracts or sub-agreements to others. (Please Note: if there is an applicant that does not have any relevant past performance and/or reporting history they will receive a neutral score or rating for these aspects of programmatic capability). (**Maximum score: 25 points**)

Other Factors: As described below, in addition to the evaluation of proposals against the criteria in B and the specific criteria in Appendix C for the different tasks, programmatic priorities may also be considered when making selection decisions. EPA plans to award one award for each task listed in Appendix C.

C. **Review and Selection Process**

Review: The proposals will be evaluated based on the criteria stated in B above and in Appendix C (depending on task) and ranked by review panels made up of EPA and non EPA staff. After proposals have been evaluated and ranked, the review panels will forward the recommended rankings to the appropriate Chesapeake Bay Program Committees. The Chesapeake Bay Program Committees, based on considerations of programmatic priorities, will forward recommended selection decisions to EPA. As the organization responsible for allocation and obligation of funds, negotiation of final work plans, and the execution of fiscal obligations, EPA will make the final decisions on funding based on the Committees' final recommendations and consideration of programmatic priorities. The number of projects funded will depend on the actual Congressional allocations and other CBP funding decisions.

Selection: As the organization responsible for allocation of funds, negotiation of final work plans and the execution of fiscal obligations, EPA will make the final decisions on funding. The selection official will be the Director or Deputy Director, Chesapeake Bay Program Office.

Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates:

August 22, 2005	Issuance of RFP
October 5, 2005	Proposal Submission Deadline (see Section IV for more information)
February 15, 2006	Approximate date for EPA to notify applicants of results
March 15, 2006	Approximate date for Applicant to submit federal grant application. Processing of grant typically takes 60 days
May 15, 2006	Approximate date for grant award

Section VI: Award Administration Information

A. **Award Notices**

Funding Decisions: It is expected that applicants will be notified in writing of funding decisions on or around **February 15, 2006** either via email or U.S. Postal Service. Notification of selection does not indicate that the applicant can start work on the project. The selected applicants will then be asked to submit a full federal grant application package (applications are available at the following website: http://www.epa.gov/region03/grants/index.htm). A Federal project officer will provide assistance in the application process, and negotiate a work plan. budget, and starting date. Processing of the grant award generally takes 60-90 days.

B. **Administrative and National Policy Requirements**

If your proposal is selected, the following information will be helpful in preparing your grant

and/or interagency application:

Procurement: Once a proposal is selected, the recipient may be required to submit before award, in addition to a full application, a copy of its written procurement procedures developed in accordance with 40 CFR 30.40 - 30.48 or 40 CFR 31.36, as applicable, for review. Other Federal agency applicants will follow the direction of the EPA project officer during the award process of the interagency agreement.

Disputes Resolution Process: Assistance agreement competition-related disputes will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures published in 70 FR (Federal Register) 3629, 3630 (January 26,2005) which can be found at: http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20051800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2005/05-1371.htm. Copies of these procedures may also be requested by contacting Veronica Kuczynski by email at kuczynski.veronica@epa.gov or fax at 410-267-5777.

DUNS Requirement: All selected applicants are required to provide a Dunn and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number when applying for Federal assistance agreements (grants or cooperative agreements) and/or interagency agreements. The DUNS number must be included in Block 5 of the Standard Form 424 entitled, Application for Federal Assistance (Rev. 9-03). Organizations can receive a DUNS number at no cost by calling the dedicated toll free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711. Additional information on obtaining a DUNS number can also be found at: http://www.dnb.com.

Federal Agencies must provide this information on the final workplan negotiated with the federal project officer during the award process of the interagency agreement.

Indirect Costs: If indirect costs are budgeted in the assistance application (grant or cooperative agreement) and the non-profit organization or educational institute does not have a previously established indirect cost rate, an indirect cost rate proposal and/or cost allocation plan will need to be prepared and submitted in accordance with the appropriate Federal cost principle, 0MB Circular A-122, "Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations" or 0MB Circular A-21, "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions" within ninety (90) days from the effective date of the award.

If a local government does not have a previously established indirect cost rate, it will need to prepare its indirect cost rate proposal and/or cost allocation plan in accordance with OMB Circular A-87, "Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments." The local government recipient whose cognizant Federal agency has been designated by OMB must develop and submit its indirect cost rate proposal to its cognizant agency within six (6) months after the close of the governmental unit's fiscal year. If the cognizant Federal agency has not been identified by OMB, the local government recipient must still develop (and when required, submit) its proposal within that period.

EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans and Quality Assurance Plans: In accordance with 40 CFR 30.54 and 31.45, projects that include the generation or use of environmental data are required to submit a Quality Management Plan (QMP) and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP).

The QMP must document quality assurance policies and practices that are sufficient to produce data of adequate quality to meet program objectives. The QMP should be prepared in accordance with EPA QA/R-2: EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans. The recipient's QMP should be reviewed and updated annually as needed. The QMP must be submitted to the EPA Project Officer and approved by the EPA Quality Management Officer at least 45 days prior to the initiation of data collection or data compilation.

The recipient must develop and implement quality assurance and quality control procedures, specifications and documentation that are sufficient to produce data of adequate quality to meet project objectives. The Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) is the document that provides comprehensive details about the quality assurance/quality control requirements and technical activities that must be implemented to ensure that project objectives are met. The QAPP should be prepared in accordance with EPA QA/R-5: EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans. The QAPP must be submitted to the EPA Project Officer at least 30 days prior to the initiation of data collection or data compilation. Requirements for QAPPs can be found at http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qa_docs.html.

Federal agency quality assurance requirements should be established for the proposed agreement consistent with EPA QA policy and requirements**.**

Federal Requirements: Non-federal applicant whose proposal are selected for federal funding must complete additional forms prior to award (see 40 CFR 30.12 and 31.10). EPA reserves the right to negotiate and/or adjust the final grant amount and work plan content prior to award. Federal agency applicants will follow the direction of the federal project officer during the award process of the interagency agreement.

Deliverables: Awarded applicants will be required to provide a chart or list of deliverables (outputs) providing items and dates due, as stated in the US EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Grant Guidance http://www.epa.gov/region3/chesapeake/grants.htm

Pre-Award Administrative Capability Review for Non-Profit Organizations: A selected non-profit organization's administrative capability is reviewed after the evaluation process is complete, and after the selection recommendation has been made. Non-profit applicants that are recommended for funding will be subject to pre-award administrative capability reviews consistent with Sections 8b, 8c and 9d of EPA Order 5700.8. A link to this Order is located at: http://intranet.epa.gov/ogd/policy/Order/5700_8.pdf

The Order, in Section 7(c) defines non-profit organizations as any corporation, trust, association, cooperative, or other organization which: (1) is operated primary for scientific, education,

service, charitable or similar purposes in the public interest; (2) is not organized primarily for profit; (3) uses its net proceeds to maintain, improve, and/or expand its operations; and (4) is subject to 40 CFR Part 30. The term does not include: colleges and universities as defined under Office of Management Budget (OMB) Circular A-21; State, local and federally-recognized Indian Tribal governments; hospitals; and organizations considered as similar to concerns under Attachment C to OMB Circular A-122.

C. **Reporting**

Quarterly or semiannual progress reports, as determined by the EPA Project Officer, will be required as a condition of this grant or cooperative agreement and/or interagency agreement award.

Section VII: Agency Contact

For administrative and technical issues regarding this RFP, please contact Danielle Algazi. All questions must be received in writing via email (Algazi.Danielle@epa.gov) with reference line referring to this RFP (RE: RFP **EPA-R3CBP-05-04)** or fax at (215) 814-2201. All questions and answers will be posted on http://www.epa.gov/region3/chesapeake/grants.htm

Section VIII: Other Information

EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals and make no awards.

In developing your proposal, you may find the following documents helpful. Websites for guidance documents are listed here. If you prefer a paper copy, please call 1-800-YOUR BAY.

All questions and answers will be posted on http://www.epa.gov/region3/chesapeake/grants.htm.

***Chesapeake 2000* Agreement** located at: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/c2k.htm

Bay Journal located at http://www.bayjournal.com

Chesapeake Bay Program Guidance for Data Management located at: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/pubs/grantguidance/CIMSPOL2001.PDF

EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans and Quality Assurance Plans - Requirements for quality assurance plans are defined in EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans (QA/R-5). These documents are located at: http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qa docs.htm.

EPA Grants website, http://www.epa.gov/ogd, if you have questions about grant issues such as costs or eligibility.

Chesapeake Bay Program Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance at:
http://www.epa.gov/region3/chesapeake/grants.htm

Additional questions about grant issues such as cost or eligibility can be obtained on the following websites: www.epa.gov/ogd or http://www.epa.gov/region3/chesapeake/grants.htm for EPA Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance. For questions pertaining to specific Tasks and/or general questions, please refer to Section VII: Agency Contact.

Chesapeake Bay Program Committee Information at:
http://www.chesapeakebay.net/committee.htm

An EPA Grants Seminar for Non-Profit organizations is being held October 12-13 in Washington, D.C. To find our more information go to
http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/non_profit_training.htm
or call 202-564-5333. The deadline for registration is October 3, 2005. ***Please note that this seminar is not connected to this RFP or competition. This notice is for informational purposes only, and attending this seminar will not impact the competition.***

Appendix A. One-Page Proposal Format
Fiscal Year 2006 Request for Proposals (RFP) for
State Tributary Strategy Implementation

(If applying for more than one Task listed in Appendix C, you must provide separate proposals for each Task. (i.e., an Appendix A. One Page Proposal Format, and an Appendix B. Expanded Proposal Format is required for each task being proposed for)

Proposal Summary Format (One page only)

Task # and Title:

Proposal Date: The date the proposal is submitted.

Applicant's Organization and Point of Contact: Include person's name and title, organization's name, address, phone, and electronic mail address, if possible.

EPA Funding Request: List the funding amount your organization is requesting to complete the task.

Cost-Share Amount: A minimum of 5% non-federal match is required for a grant or cooperative agreement. To calculate the minimum required cost-share amount, divide the amount of federal funds request by .95 to get the total project cost. The difference between the total project cost and the federal funding requested will be the 5% non-federal share. (Example: $50,000/.95 equals $52,632 total project cost. Subtracting$50,000 from $52,632 gives the minimum 5% non-federal cost share of $2,632.). If a federal agency submits a proposal (interagency agreement), they must provide an Agency share.

Cost-Share Percentage: You may be providing more that the minimum 5% cost-share. In that case, you should list the cost-share percentage. Divide the amount you are providing by the total amount of the project, and multiply by 100. (Example: Grantee provides $10,000 worth of inkind services and asks EPA to provide $50,000 of grant funding. Total project cost is $60,000. 10,000/60,000 multiplied by 100 equals 16.7%.)

Project Abstract : Identify the task number and title found in Section I. C and Appendix C, briefly describe the project and discuss how the proposal addresses the Task in Appendix C of this announcement that you are proposing for.

Appendix B. Expanded Proposal Format Fiscal Year 2005
Request for Proposals (RFP) for State Tributary Strategy Implementation

---

The following information must be provided or the proposal may not be considered complete and may not be evaluated.

Expanded Format: Proposals shall not exceed twelve pages. The proposal must be submitted on 8 ½ x 11 paper. Note that the twelve pages must include all supporting materials, including resumes or curriculum vitae and letters of support. With the exception of documentation of non-profit status, if the proposal includes more than twelve pages, the additional pages will be discarded and not considered in the review. **Applicant's responses should be numbered and submitted according to the format listed below**.

1. Name, address, contact information of the applicant:

2. Background: Include the following in this section:
2.a. Brief description of your organization.
2.b. Documentation of non-profit status, if applicable.
2.c. Brief biographies of applicant lead(s) including resumes and/or curriculum vitae.
2.d. Description of organization's past experience as a recipient of an assistance agreement (grant).

3. **Clear, concise narrative** of (l) the applicant's qualifications and preliminary proposal of activities and approaches to address needs stated in this RFP. (2) Explain how your organization is qualified to perform this work. You can include a curriculum vitae or resume of the principal investigators in Section 2. Background. These must be included in the twelve pages maximum for the proposal.

4. **Workplan:** Include the following in this section:
4a. Identify the Task number and title being proposed for in Appendix C and provide a clear, concise narrative of how your organization will implement the Task and how it supports the mission of your organization.

4b. Provide a breakdown by major budget categories (typically personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual, construction, other, and indirect). If you have subgrantees or contractors, specify how much of the funding will go to them.

5. **Previously Funded Projects**: If you have been previously funded by the CBP, please list the project title, date, EPA project number, and brief description of results.

6. **Review Criteria**: Address in narrative form each of the following review criteria identified in Section V.B. and any additional criteria in Appendix C for the task being proposed for: (If possible, identify by the review criteria number and title followed by your narrative.)

Appendix C - Chesapeake Bay Program Tasks for Funding

Sponsoring Subcommittee:	Land Growth and Stewardship Subcommittee
Task # 1 Title:	**Local implementation of Tributary Strategies through changes in local codes and ordinances**
Cost Estimate:	$50,000
Project Duration:	One year
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	**Sound Land Use:** • Provide technical and financial assistance to local governments to plan for or revise plans, ordinances and subdivision regulations to provide for the conservation and sustainable use of the forest and agricultural lands. • By 2005, in cooperation with local government, identify and remove state and local impediments to low impact development designs to encourage the use of such approaches and minimize water quality impacts. • Work with communities and local governments to encourage sound land use planning and practices that address the impacts of growth, development and transportation on the watershed. **Chesapeake 2000 Water Quality Protection and Restoration goal:** "Achieve and maintain the water quality necessary to support the aquatic living resources of the Bay and its tributaries and to protect human health." Sound land use practices are integral to maintaining our achievement in restoring water quality of the Bay and its tributaries (i.e., integral to cap maintenance.) **2005 Directive 04-2 Meeting the Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Goals – Next Steps**: Addresses what the Blue Ribbon Panel emphasized — "the challenge posed by development patterns in the watershed, and the danger that growth could weaken, and possibly outstrip, our collective efforts to restore the water quality and habitat of the Bay and its tidal tributaries, ….[D]evelopments each day are adding to the stormwater pollution burden. … New, more effective, technologies such 'as low impact development' to encourage environmentally sensitive design should be emphasized and linked with preservation and restoration of forest buffers."
Expected Methodology:	• This project will involve providing technical assistance to local governments to initiate revision of local planning codes and ordinances to promote environmentally sensitive development practices, improved urban stormwater management and/or protection of natural resources such as wetlands, riparian buffers, forests. Such revisions should take into account sub-watershed health, and nutrient and sediment reduction goals

	identified under the tributary strategies. • This funding either would be provided directly to interested local governments, or to organizations that would provide such service to interested local governments. In either case, the local government must demonstrate strong support for the project prior to funding, and a willingness to participate in technology transfer of the results to neighboring communities specifically and throughout the watershed more generally.
Expected Outputs and Deliverables:	• A report outlining detailing the methodology for assistance provided and the resulting specific recommended changes to local codes and ordinances to support implementation of Tributary Strategies and to the extent possible local watershed plans. • One outreach event to other local communities to describe the methodology and final results of the project. • A written plan outlining next steps to implement the recommended changes to local codes and ordinances. This implementation should be supported by the local government(s) involved. Quarterly Progress Reports
Environmental Results: **Expected Outcomes:**	This project would catalyze local actions at the sub-watershed level in order to: • Reduce nutrient and sediment by supporting Tributary Strategy implementation though local code and ordinance changes. • Promote use of environmentally sensitive development / low impact development BMPs to reduce nutrient and sediment loadings from development. (This would support urban nutrient management goals and infiltration practices which are a significant focus of Tributary Strategies.) • Support maintenance of nutrient and sediment reduction in the face of continued growth and development. (From 1990 to 2000, population increased by 8 % while impervious cover increased by 41 %. It is anticipated that in 2020 population will grow by over 1 million people.) • Reduce conversion of valuable resource lands such riparian buffers, forests and wetlands to development. (We continue to lose 100 acres of forest every day).
Additional Evaluation Criteria	• Demonstrate that the applicant/community has made substantial progress with regard to watershed management planning. (Maximum score: 10 points) • Degree to which projects involve development of ordinance language that could be incorporated by the local government(s) involved and could be used as a model to other local governments. (Maximum score: 10 points)

Sponsoring Subcommittee:	Nutrient Subcommittee (NSC ID# NSC06-2)
Task #2 Title:	**Statistical and Hydrologic Analysis of Sediment Data**
Cost Estimate:	$45,000
Project Duration:	One year
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	By 2010, correct the nutrient and sediment related problems in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries sufficiently to remove the Bay and the tidal portions of its tributaries from the list of impaired water under the Clean Water Act.
Expected Methodology:	The USGS recently published a report on historic sediment yields in the Chesapeake Bay watershed from 1952-2001. Information exists on the spatial distribution of sediment yields (USGS Report on historic sediment yields in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed from 1952-2001), but information is lacking on the sources of that sediment and why one watershed or region has higher sediment yields than another. The objective of this topic is to determine the sources of that sediment, the relative contribution of total load from each source and how seasonality and intense storm events affect sediment loads. Factors that influence sediment loss and transport, such as: (1) land use, (2) slope, (3) soils, (4) riparian cover, (5) percent conservation versus conventional tilled agriculture, and (6) physiographic region should be analyzed. Possible methodologies include GIS, multivariate statistical analysis of best subsets regression, stepwise multiple linear regression, principal components analysis, or other means to determine relationships, sources and relative impact on loads. Methodology used to analyze the effects of seasonality and rainfall intensity should be explained, including potential data sets.

Expected Outputs/Deliverables:	1. Development of a multivariate statistical approach that determines the significant sources of watershed sediment that can be used to relate watershed characteristics to sediment transport and loads at varying spatial scales. 2. Identification of significant sources and their relationship to sediment loads within major Chesapeake Bay tributaries, including land use, soils, slope, riparian cover, and physiographic region. 3. Determination of the significance of intense and large scale storm events on seasonal and annual sediment loading. Quarterly Progress Reports
Environmental Results: **Expected Outcomes:**	This project will fill information gaps in the technical assumptions/processes used to design, monitor and calibrate sediment transport and impact within the Chesapeake Bay estuary. It will provide information useful for Chesapeake Bay Program Phase V Watershed Model calibration, the evaluation of sediments role in meeting living resource and habitat goals of *Chesapeake 2000* commitments, and in strategic planning. Models that are being used to set tributary loadings critically need information on sediment sources and the timing of sediment loading. The expected outcomes would include the answers to the following questions: 1. What are the statistically significant sources (and relative percent) of watershed sediment by major tributary? These sources include land use, soils, slope, riparian cover, and physiographic region? 2. Do these statistically significant sediment sources change with watershed scale? 3. How is sediment transported seasonally? What is the effect of large storms such as hurricanes on sediment transport? How does watershed scale affect sediment transport in different seasons and during large storm events? The outcomes will assist the Chesapeake Bay Program in understanding sediment pollutant loads to come closer to the Chesapeake 2000 goal of reducing sediments that enter the Chesapeake Bay, thus improving off shore and shallow water estuarine habitat.

Additional Evaluation Criteria:	• Ability to identify and designate significance of various watershed sources of sediment. (Maximum score: 5 points) • Ability to provide seasonal quantification of sediment transport. (Maximum score: 5 points) • Evaluating the effect of storm intensity on sediment transport. (Maximum score: 5 points)

Sponsoring Subcommittee:	Nutrient Subcommittee (NSC ID# NSC06-8)
Task # 3 **Title:**	**Assessing Nutrient Reductions from Precision Agriculture and Reduced Rate Precision Agriculture**
Cost Estimate:	$40,000-$50,000
Project Duration:	One year
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	By 2010, correct the nutrient and sediment related problems in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries sufficiently to remove the Bay and the tidal portions of its tributaries from the list of impaired water under the Clean Water Act.
Expected Outputs and Deliverables:	A final report will be produced containing the range of reductions (in edge of field and edge of root zone losses) for each site condition defined under "Expected Methodology" above. Electronic copies of the data used for analysis will accompany the final report. Quarterly Progress Reports
Environmental Results **Expected Outcomes:**	• The project will provide nutrient reduction efficiencies for Precision Agriculture and Reduced Rate Precision Agriculture. • Improving knowledge of effectiveness of specific BMPs designed to reduce source loads. • Provides timely information to managers, planners and stakeholders on effective options for maintaining productive agricultural capacity while minimizing the off-site water quality impact. • Increase knowledge towards understanding the CBP rate of progress for reducing nutrients to the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries by 2010.
Additional Evaluation Criteria	• The extent to which the proposed considers the variety of soils, topography, and crop types found on croplands located within the Chesapeake Bay watershed (Maximum score: 10 points)

Sponsoring Subcommittee:	Nutrient Subcommittee (NSC ID# NSC06-1)
Task # 4 Title:	**Estimating the Proportion of Total Sediment and Nutrient Loads Contributed by Failing (eroded) Riverbanks in Rural Lands**
Cost Estimate:	$100,000/yr Total project not to exceed $300,000.
Project Duration:	Three Years
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	By 2010, correct the nutrient and sediment related problems in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries sufficiently to remove the Bay and the tidal portions of its tributaries from the list of impaired water under the Clean Water Act.
Expeted Methodology:	The Nutrient Subcommittee recognizes the challenges inherent in estimating total sediment and nutrient loads from failing banks on a watershed basis. Proposals must include a detailed description of the proposed methodology. The project should answer the following questions: • What proportion of the total sediment, N and P loads above fall line are contributed by poorly vegetated, failing riverbanks in rural watersheds? • How does this load compare to the natural erosion rate of well-forested riverbanks? • What landscape indicators could be used by the Chesapeake Bay Program, in the absence of a physical survey, to estimate the potential for and/or extent of failing banks in a watershed? **No recommendation for award will be made unless the proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the challenge and contains an experimental design that has a high possibility of success.**

Expected Outputs and Deliverables:	1. Produce summary report describing methodology used and results of the study. Report will include detailed description of methodology and data used to evaluate/determine extent of failing (eroding) streambanks will be included. Report will fill the following information gaps: • Estimate the percentage of the total loads (N, P, and sediment) in a watershed that comes from failing/eroding stream banks. • Relate the rate of erosion in a restored channel to the natural rate of erosion in a well vegetated streambank to the average erosion rate in a failing streambank. (Three conditions and their relationship to each other.) • Landscape indicators that can be used by the Chesapeake Bay Program or jurisdictions to estimate failing (eroding) streambank potential within a watershed at varying spatial scales. • Extent to which study results are transferable to watersheds/stream reaches outside of the study area(s). 2. Submission of one or more articles to peer reviewed journals. 3. Minimum of two presentations to the CBP Nutrient Subcommittee/workgroup. Presentation one approximately one year after project begins to show proposed methodology and results to date. Presentation two after project completion, providing summary of results and recommendations. Quarterly Progress Reports
Environmental Results: **Expected Outcome**	Streambank erosion above fall line in the major tributaries is considered one of the biggest contributors of sediment to tidal and non-tidal waters. The full impact of this erosion and the nutrient loads associated with it, are unknown at the basin scale. This project will fill significant data gaps, which will improve model calibration and provide management insight regarding the needs for reducing sedmentation associated with water clarity and improved water quality in the Chesapeake Bay.

Additional Evaluation Criteria	• Does the proposal include an experimental design that has a high possibility of success? (Maximum score: 25 points)? • Does the submitting organization or collaborative have the technical expertise to conduct the project? (Maximum score: 15 points) • How will accuracy/confidence level of method be established? (Maximum score: 10 points)

Sponsoring Subcommittee:	Nutrient Subcommittee (NSC ID# NSC06-6)
Task # 5 Title:	**Calculate the Water Quality Co-efficiency of Urban Trees**
Cost Estimate:	$70,000-$90,000
Project Duration:	One Year
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	By 2010, correct the nutrient and sediment related problems in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries sufficiently to remove the Bay and the tidal portions of its tributaries from the list of impaired water under the Clean Water Act.
Expected Methodology:	UFORE-Hydro, a water quality model selected for its moderate complexity but relative ease of use, will be available for testing in the Chesapeake Bay watershed in 2005. UFORE-Hydro is part of a suite of tools developed by the USDA Forest Service/SUNY-Syracuse as part of the Urban Forest Effects (UFORE) Model. It will be the primary tool used in this study to determine the efficiency of vegetation in reducing flows and pollutants (N, P, sediments) from urban runoff. The proposed methodology is to apply the UFORE-Hydro model to 6 watersheds at 3 different scales (i.e., small (<300 ha), medium (~300-2000 ha), and large (>2000 ha)—which may optionally be in a nested arrangement (i.e., small will be in medium will be in large). Watersheds will be selected with the help of the CBP Forestry Workgroup and will likely target headwater drainage areas. The subwatersheds will represent a range of conditions from moderately urbanized to ultra-urbanized (i.e., 30 to 85% urban land use) and will be among those that have water flow and quality monitoring stations reporting data at least on a daily and weekly basis respectively. This data will be used for model calibration. No additional instrumentation required. The successful proposal will include a detailed methodology including relevant data sets and sufficient sampling. At a minimum, the following data will need to be entered into the model: precipitation (hourly data, point gage within 2 km or use of Nexrad radar), topography (horizontal point elevations at 30 m USGS or finer), and cover (impervious to canopy cover at 30 m). Calibration will balance storm hydrographs, base flow and water quality in current conditions and allow for management simulations of forest

	cover changes in each selected subwatershed. Several scenarios of forest cover change will also be selected and the model run to predict responses. The successful proposal should also seek to run two out of the six subwatersheds with the more sophisticated RHESSys and/or SWMM, and/or other fully-distributed model in order to compare functions of important parameters such as vegetation cover. This process should be designed to test the relative applicability of both models in a minimum of two watersheds.
Expected Outputs and Deliverables:	1. A summary report addressing the following four questions and supporting data: • Based on location, to what extent do trees within a watershed, prevent urban stormwater pollution? • How can we accurately credit the water quality improvements that result from the maintenance and restoration of urban forests and urban riparian forests? • What is the hydrologic benefit of converting impervious area to vegetation and how is this affected by watershed position? • How can we use existing land use models to help calculate the efficiency of innovative urban practices in improving water quality coming from developed watersheds? 2. Individual Subwatershed Reports: (a) description of the likely nutrient and sediment benefits of increasing vegetation in urban areas; (b) the results of reasonable, multiple model scenarios that test incremental forestation in the subwatershed and the degree of non-point source pollution reduction; and (c) an annotated list of issues that may affect the use of the model for approximating the benefits of urban trees and vegetation to storm flow and water quality. 3. A comparison of UFORE-Hydro to RYSYS, SWMM or a fully-distributed watershed model in analyzing the benefits of urban trees to the Bay with raw data of compared outputs.

	4. Quarterly and final report (summary and individual subwatershed) will be submitted in electronic format, as well as all supporting data. Format will be consistent with Chesapeake Bay Program guidelines as outlined in the Grant Guidance document. 5. The Urban Stormwater Workgroup and the Forestry Workgroup will receive updates/reports on any issues that may significantly impact the project completion schedule or deliverables. 6. QAPP and QMP should be submitted with this proposal. 7. A presentation to a joint session of the CBP Urban and Forestry Workgroups after project completion, providing summary of results and recommendations.
Environmental Results **Expected Outcomes:**	Conversion of forest or agricultural lands to urban increases the potential for rapid surface stormwater runoff, conveyance of nutrients, sediment and other pollutants directly into open water systems, and a reduction in groundwater recharge. Converting impervious surfaces back to a condition that promotes infiltration, stormwater retention and nutrient use is assumed beneficial. However, quantifying those benefits is difficult, yet critical for local government action and a successful public outreach program. The primary outcome of this project will be the ability to apply an efficiency benefit to the Chesapeake Bay watershed model for urban trees (and other vegetation) which will enable the Chesapeake Bay Program to assess the rate of progress on reaching the nutrient and sediment *Chesapeake 2000* goals. It will result in the type of information needed to support outreach efforts and expanding local government urban vegetative cover activities.
Additional Evaluation Criteria	• Familiarity with UFORE. (Maximum score:10 points) • Collaboration with on-going research in the area of urban forest effects, such as the USDA Forest Service Urban Research Center(s) and Baltimore Ecosystem Study (Maximum score: 5 points)

Sponsoring Subcommittee:	Communications and Education Subcommittee
Task # 6 Title:	**Chesapeake Club Outreach Initiative**
Cost Estimate:	$100,000 to $500,000 Proposals should specify a specific level of funding within this range and specify the associated scope of work and deliverables. Alternatively, proposals may be structured to propose graduated levels of funding with specified scopes of work and deliverables at the various levels of funding.
Project Duration:	Twelve to eighteen months (tentatively January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007)
Supported C2K Commitments:	5.1.1 – Make education and outreach a priority in order to achieve public awareness and personal involvement on behalf of the Bay and local watersheds. 5.1.2 – Provide information to enhance the ability of citizen and community groups to participate in Bay restoration activities on their property and in their local watersheds.
Expected Methodology:	The Chesapeake Club outreach initiative aims to engage Bay watershed residents by reaching target audiences with clear, simple messages that result in an improved stewardship ethic. By encouraging residents to adopt behaviors that reduce pollution to the Bay, additional residents can do their part to help in the restoration of the Bay and its rivers. The Chesapeake Club outreach initiative aims to reduce nutrient pollution from non-point sources, while engaging new audiences about their role in Bay restoration. The Chesapeake Club outreach initiative targets segments of the General Public to raise their awareness of the Bay and add them to the ranks of our Interested Public. The Chesapeake Bay Program proposes the Chesapeake Club outreach initiative as an ongoing campaign building on the momentum created by the pilot campaign in the Washington-metro region. Fiscal Year 2006 funding will allow the expansion of the outreach initiative to reach other target markets, audiences and/or behaviors, and will support two principle components of work: (1) building implementation relationships with programmatic partners in support of the campaign, and (2) developing and implementing paid advertising, guerilla tactics and print collaterals to reach the target audience(s) with key messages. The grantee will work with the Chesapeake Bay Program to continue to implement the Chesapeake Club outreach initiative in one or more media markets within the Chesapeake Bay watershed targeting one or more audiences and/or behaviors. The final selection of target markets, audiences and behaviors will be determined by the amount of funds available for this project (derived both from Bay Program allocations and matching dollars contributed by campaign partners) and by the expressed preferences of Bay Program and campaign partners.

	The grantee will build upon existing information and research to develop the campaign and work with Bay Program and potential campaign partners to obtain consensus on stewardship message and target behaviors. The grantee is expected to develop and initiate pre- and post-market tests to determine target markets, help develop/hone outreach messages and measure campaign impact on target audiences. The grantee will build upon existing concepts and materials; develop or modify ad content; develop creative products and fulfillment materials; purchase air time and ad space; seek reduced ad fees, pro bono opportunities, and other partnerships as available to maximize the campaign's impact in promoting a conservation ethic and individual stewardship responsibility. The Bay Program is proposing to allocate between $100,000 and $500,000 in support of the campaign. Proposals are encouraged to leverage additional funding from one or more campaign partners, such as state or local government agencies or non-profit organizations.
Expected Outputs and Deliverables:	Expected Outputs include: final television, radio and/or print advertisements; pre- and post- survey data analysis and interpretation; collateral materials including brochures, promotional materials and internet content; and a comprehensive final report gauging the overall effectiveness of the campaign. Quarterly progress reports.
Environmental Results: **Expected Outcomes:**	The activity aligns with Bay Program commitments to make education and outreach a priority in order to achieve public awareness and personal involvement on behalf of the Bay and local watersheds and to support of tributary strategy implementation. Outcomes include: • Behavior changes. • Non-point source pollution reduction as a result of public awareness and involvement.

Sponsoring Subcommittee:	Communication and Education Subcommittee
Task # 7 Title:	**2007 Biennial Chesapeake Bay Education Summit**
Cost Range:	$20,000
Project Duration:	Twelve to twenty-four months (tentatively January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2007)
Supported C2K Commitments:	5.1.1 - Make education and outreach a priority in order to achieve public awareness and personal involvement on behalf of the Bay and local watersheds 5.1.4 – Beginning with the class of 2005, provide a meaningful Bay or stream outdoor experience for every school student in the watershed before graduation form high school 5.1.5 - Continue to forge partnerships with the Departments of Education and institutions of higher learning in each jurisdiction to integrate information about the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed into school curricula and university programs 5.1.6 - Provide students and teachers alike with opportunities to directly participate in local restoration and protection projects, and to support stewardship efforts in schools and on school property 5.4.1 - Strengthen partnerships with Delaware, New York and West Virginia by promoting communication and by seeking agreements on issues of mutual concern
Expected Methodology:	The grantee will be responsible for all event logistics, including securing meeting space, meals and overnight accommodations for out-of-town attendees. The grantee will be responsible for marketing and targeted outreach to assure optimal turnout by key participants. The grantee will also be responsible for facilitating the planning of Summit content, soliciting presenters and organizing sessions, tracks and/or field trips. The Education Workgroup will function as the planning committee and will be instrumental in designing and developing the Summit structure and content, and recommending and/or serving as session presenters, moderators and facilitators. The grantee shall provide an expert facilitator to serve as lead facilitator for the Summit. The facilitator must be adequately knowledgeable about environmental issues/opportunities in the Chesapeake Bay region and sufficiently experienced and skilled to assist participants in articulating their interests, identifying areas of agreement, and developing consensus recommendations for follow-up. The grantee will serve as lead recorder during the Summit and following the Summit will be responsible for the development of a summary based on notes from flip charts, minutes and any relevant materials provided by the participants and/or

	workgroup chair and staff. The grantee shall draft a meeting summary and provide copies to the Education Workgroup Chair and other relevant parties. The grantee shall also aid in the formulation of a document based on the outcomes of the Summit by supplying a list of the major consensus issues (overall and by jurisdiction). This list should be prioritized based on the Summit discussions.
Expected Outputs and Deliverables:	Expected Outputs include: Pre-meeting(s) with Education Workgroup chair and staff to determine summit objectives; fulfilling all site logistics and accommodations for summit attendees; facilitation of summit sessions; meeting notes and a Summit summary report. Quarterly Reports The 2007 Chesapeake Bay Program Education Summit. The grantee will work with the Bay Program Education Workgroup to plan, facilitate and host a two-day education summit (location TBD) among outdoor education professionals and providers from jurisdictions within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, as well as other interested parties.
Environmental Results: **Expected Outcomes:**	The Education Summit is a stand-alone commitment of the Executive Council of the Chesapeake Bay Program as outlined in Directive No. 98-1: "Convene an Education Summit of the four interagency education groups in 1999 and every two years thereafter. The Chesapeake Bay Education Summit is a key tool in the Bay Program's efforts to forge partnerships with and among formal and informal education providers and departments of education in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to support implementation of the MWEE. The outcomes of the Education Summit are reported through the Principals' Staff Committee to the Chesapeake Executive Council." Implementing the Education Summit will: • Improve understanding and support of the meaningful watershed educational experience (MWEE) among school administrators and teachers • Provide high quality examples of MWEE programs for all participants to improve understanding of how to implement programs effectively • Improve coordination among service providers, teachers and schools • Increase the number of students reached with MWEE programs • Improve the mechanisms for tracking MWEEs • Assess the quality of MWEE programs and how they support student academic performance and involvement in stewardship activities

Sponsoring Subcommittee:	Communications and Education Subcommittee
Task # 8 Title:	**Communications Associate (Media Relations)**
Cost Estimate:	$50,000 - $70,000
Project Duration:	Ongoing (Five year project period with one year budget periods)
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	Make education and outreach a priority in order to achieve public awareness and personal involvement on behalf of the Bay and local watersheds. (Keystone Commitment) Provide information to enhance the ability of citizen and community groups to participate in Bay restoration activities on their property and in their local watersheds.
Expected Methodology:	The Communications Associate would be a new, on-going position within the Bay structure. The Associate will be primarily responsible for developing relationships with key members of the media and providing them information in a clear and concise manner. As a member of the communications team, the Communications Associate will also be responsible for helping to develop and implement a broad array of communications programs and projects. The Communications Associate's roles will include: (1) maintaining media lists in targeted issue/geographic areas; (2) drafting collateral materials for the media (press releases, backgrounders, etc.); (3) working with scientists and researchers to develop storylines detailing the health of the Bay and the status of its restoration; (4) conducting background research in support of communications materials; (5) organizing media briefings, press conferences and on-the-ground media events; (6) preparing staff for interviews; (7) developing op-ed articles; (8) expanding media relations to include all accessible print and broadcast outlets; (9) assisting with the implementation of an array of communications projects as needed; and (10) assisting with consensus building for communications initiatives through the worm of the Communications and Education Subcommittee and Communications Workgroup. Day-to-day programmatic guidance for the Communications Associate will be provided by the Director of the Chesapeake Bay Program's Communications Office in consultation with the chair of the Bay Program's Communications and Education Subcommittee. An ideal candidate will have demonstrated excellence in written and oral communications that are clear, concise and to the point. Ability to perform background research and analysis, ensuring that communication products are complete and technically accurate. Ability to analyze audience and communications medium and appropriately tailor text and graphics for optimum communication effectiveness. Good organizational skills. Ability to work independently under tight deadlines. Ability to plan and conduct highly effective meetings, press briefing and

	public events. Proficiency with Microsoft word processing and presentation programs; experience with graphics software is preferred. Interest in learning how a multi-party, governmental environmental management partnership makes decisions effectively and sets and achieves goals through collaborative processes. Ability to work with people in a consensus building work environment.
Expected Outputs and Deliverables:	Specific activities will be coordinated with the Bay Program Communications Director and include: • Generating press coverage for Bay Program events and announcements by releasing at least 10-12 press releases with associated press events and/or briefing as appropriate. Press events and releases will be coordinated with the Communications and Education Subcommittee chair and will be approved by the signatory representatives from each Bay Program partner. • Promoting Bay Program efforts among local, regional and national media by fostering better relationships with journalists including more members of the regional and national press corps. Expanding press release distribution through the use of regional and national Newswire services and all accessible print and broadcast outlets. • Increasing the public's awareness of the role and activities of the Chesapeake Bay Program through increased media coverage. • Working to promote the Stewardship and Community Engagement commitments stated in Chesapeake 2000, as determined by the Bay Program's Implementation Committee and directed by the Communications and Education Subcommittee. • Other outreach tasks as assigned Deliverables include: • 10-12 press releases with associated press events and/or briefing as appropriate • News clipping file • One to two media training sessions for Bay Program staff and partners; and preparing staff for interviews as needed Quarterly Progress Reports
Environmental Results: **Expected Outcomes:**	The Communications Associate's activities help achieve several keystone commitments of the Chesapeake Bay Program. The Communications Associate will help build public understanding and support for new and expanded strategies and public investment in Bay protection and restoration. Furthermore, increasing outreach and education to motivate public support and engagement is critical to the successful implementation of the tributary strategies.

Sponsoring Subcommittee:	Toxics Subcommittee
Task # 9 Title:	**Sediment Trend Analysis of the Elizabeth River**
Cost Estimate:	$90,000 - $98,600
Project Duration:	Approximately six months
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	**Water Quality Protection and Restoration:** Achieve and maintain the water quality necessary to support the aquatic living resources of the Bay and its tributaries and to protect human health. **Priority Urban Waters** • Support the restoration of the Anacostia River, Baltimore Harbor, and Elizabeth River and their watersheds as models for urban river restoration in the Bay basin. **Toxics 2000** – Restoring Impacted Areas – "…begin implementing plans to deal with contaminated sediment which identify locations to target for sediment remediation, applicable technologies and approaches for addressing contaminated sediment, and stakeholders to partner with to ensure that the plans are implemented." The Elizabeth River was designated a "Region of Concern" in the 1999 Bay program Toxics Characterization.
Expected Outputs/ Deliverables:	1. Identify the net sediment transport pathways, and their sources and sinks in the Elizabeth River 2. Map the dynamic behavior (stability) of the sediments in the Elizabeth River 3. Correlate the patterns of transport and dynamic behavior with known contaminant concentrations contained in the sediments of the Elizabeth River 4. Based on these findings, determine the fate and behavior of contaminants, and assess the remediation options that are less likely to cause any further environmental damage Deliverable: Sediment Trend Analysis Final Report
Expected Methodology:	Collection of samples of surficial bottom sediment. Grain size distribution analysis. 4 to 6 months from start date of fieldwork to data compilation and completion of Sediment Trend Analysis Final Report.

Environmental Results: **Expected Outcomes:**	This 6-month project will provide a sediment distribution data set that will help to direct on-the-ground sediment remediation projects planned in the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River. There are several sediment remediation projects that have been planned or are underway under the authority of federal and private entities. In addition there are several former creosote plant sites that are not currently active with sediment remediation but are expected to be in the future. The Sediment Trend Analysis (STA) data will be used by these parties, in conjunction with existing chemical contaminant data, to plan and conduct sediment remediation projects. The STA will also provide the ability to make predictive estimates of the movement of sediments that are re-suspended during sediment dredging and remediation projects. The same type of STA project has been conducted in the Anacostia River. The Anacostia Watershed Toxics Alliance, EPA/Navy management, and NOAA scientists have used the STA data to support the identification and prioritization of sediment remediation in different areas of the river. Results from that study were an integral part of the decision process to arrive at management Areas of Concern within the Anacostia. The outputs were also valuable as a foundation to identifying previously unrecognized sources to the river. Some results from the trend analysis were not intuitively obvious, based merely on average grain size determinations, but were corroborated by other subsequent studies of the river. All in all, many of the findings were consistent with ancillary knowledge of the river; with the computer model generated for the river, and also with complementary data and information that were generated after the Anacostia study. The same utility will be realized for this data in the Elizabeth River. The STA data will be used to calibrate future numerical models of sediment dynamics in the Elizabeth River and could possibly be a part of calibrating a bay-wide sediment transport model to help meet the commitments contained in the *Chesapeake 2000* agreement.
Additional Evaluation Criteria:	• Organization's experience in conducting sediment trend analyses in heavily contaminated water bodies. (Maximum score: 20 points) • Organization's experience in guiding the utilization of STA data, in conjunction with chemical contaminant data, to effectively target remediation options (Maximum score: 20 points). • Organization's ability to provide data to serve the Chesapeake Bay sediment transport model. (Maximum score: 20 points)

Task #10 Title:	Financing Chesapeake Bay Restoration
Cost Estimate Range:	$45,000 to $75,000 per year
Project Duration:	3 years
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	By 2010, correct the nutrient and sediment related problems in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries sufficiently to remove the Bay and the tidal portions of its tributaries from the list of impaired waters under the Clean Water Act.
Expected Methodology:	The grantee will build upon efforts of the Chesapeake Bay Blue Ribbon Finance Panel and the Financing Authority Committee to develop financing alternatives for tributary strategy implementation. The project will support actions in response to the Principals' Staff Committee and Executive Council's instructions on how to proceed with establishment of a financing authority and coordination of existing funding programs. The grantee will be responsible for working with the Chesapeake Bay Program partners to address follow up requests from the Executive Council on the organizational template for the financing authority. This may include establishing a work group, convening meetings, contacting experts, and developing further analysis of specific issues. The grantee is expected to manage the Voluntary Funding Network which will (1) establish a better mutual understanding of how existing financing programs operate; (2) explore possibilities for greater effectiveness in financing programs; and (3) analyze ways to improve financing of tributary strategy implementation. The Voluntary Funding Network will also seek to identify possibilities for "co-funding" projects The grantee will be responsible for all event logistics, including securing meeting space, meals, and overnight accommodations as appropriate. The grantee will be responsible for all support materials and meeting summaries.
Expected Outputs And Deliverables:	• 2 to 8 Meetings of Chesapeake Bay Financing Authority Committee and/or Voluntary Chesapeake Bay Watershed Funding Network and/or any follow up group which may need to be established regarding the financing authority • 1 outreach activity per partner jurisdiction regarding financing for tributary strategy implementation • List of possible projects for co-funding • Briefing paper regarding "hardship communities" and how to address their financing needs

Environmental Results: **Expected Outcomes:**	The availability of funding is one factor which affects the rate of effective implementation of tributary strategies. Estimates for the cost of tributary strategies ranges from 12 to 28 billion dollars. Developing a strategy to use existing money more efficiently and effectively and to identify new funding streams is crucial for tributary strategy implementation. Outcomes: • Additional funding or better coordinated funding should increase the quantity and/or rate of implementation of best management practices described in state tributary strategies. The expected outcome would be an increase in the number of best management practices implemented on the ground. • This activity will continue our development of a funding strategy for Bay water quality restoration.
Additional Evaluation Criteria	Demonstrated experience in and knowledge of the development of financing alternatives for Chesapeake Bay water quality restoration efforts. (Maximum score: 25 points)

Task #11 Title:	Coordinating the Nutrient Subcommittee
Cost Estimate Range:	$75,000 to $90,000
Project Duration:	3 years
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	By 2010, correct the nutrient and sediment related problems in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries sufficiently to remove the Bay and the tidal portions of its tributaries from the list of impaired waters under the Clean Water Act.
Expected Methodology:	The grantee will be expected to provide technical, administrative and analytical support to the Chesapeake Bay Program partners regarding nutrient and sediment pollution in the Bay through the Nutrient Subcommittee and its workgroups. The primary charge of the Nutrient Subcommittee is to coordinate nutrient and sediment reduction strategies among the jurisdictions. In general support of that mission, the grantee will carry out the following activities: • develop program criteria; • establish methodologies for collecting and evaluating nutrient and sediment reduction results; • assess benefits to water quality derived from implementation of nutrient and sediment reduction practices; • identify needed research; • promote information sharing, education and outreach. More specifically the grantee will have three major areas of responsibility: 1. The grantee will function as the agricultural nonpoint source technical expert at the Chesapeake Bay Program Office. In that role, the grantee will lead efforts to analyze emerging agricultural nutrient and sediment reducing technologies, techniques and research to assess their possible contribution to the achievement of Chesapeake Bay Program water quality goals and objectives. As the agricultural expert, the grantee will: • Keep abreast of the latest technologies, practices and techniques for reducing nutrient and sediment pollution through attendance at and participation in national scientific conferences and workshops. • Develop policies and protocols for securing jurisdictional agreement on new best management practices definitions, efficiencies, progress reporting mechanisms and implementation costs. • Seek out and provides evaluations of alternatives to current operations. 2. The grantee will coordinate basin-wide jurisdiction-based tracking and pubic reporting of best management practices implementation progress. To track progress the grantee will: • Provide technical support to jurisdictions resource assessments to ensure

	accurate accounting. • Develop systems for tracking new BMPs addressing previously untracked sources of nutrient and sediment loads. 3. The grantee will also be involved in applying the Chesapeake Bay watershed model as a tool to assist in policy development and the technical assessment of the benefits to water quality derived from implementation of nonpoint source nutrient reduction activities. To carry out this responsibility, the grantee will: • Establish historic trends and links among and between Agricultural Census (land use), fertilizer sales, animal populations and distribution, and crop/crop rotations within the Chesapeake Bay basin. • Develop methodologies for forecasting changes in land use, nutrient applications, animal populations and crop distribution for "what if" future watershed model scenarios. • Analyze historic and current national, regional, and local data sets to establish trends and relationships for their use in Chesapeake Bay Program management planning.
Expected Outputs and Deliverables:	• Monthly meetings of the Nutrient Subcommittee and regular meetings of its workgroups, including support documents and summaries of meetings • Documents containing the analysis and recommendations for Best Management Practices regarding efficiencies, cost effectiveness, implementation tracking and watershed model • Written evaluations of national, regional and local data sets for appropriate use within the Chesapeake Bay watershed model
Environmental Results: **Expected Outcomes:**	The effectiveness of best management practices to reduce nutrient and sediment pollution largely influence our ability to restore the Bay. This activity will improve our knowledge of practices and new technologies, provide additional analysis of the effectiveness of individual practices and overall tributary strategies, coordinate information sharing among jurisdictions, and promote education and outreach on practices. Additional information on the effectiveness of best management practices to control nutrient and sediment pollution will improve our ability to restore water quality in the Bay.

Sponsoring Subcommittee	Nutrient Subcommittee (NSC ID# NSC05-8)
Task #12 Title:	Develop Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment Reduction Efficiencies for Conservation Practices found in Tributary Strategies
Funding Estimate:	$90,000/year Total not to exceed $180,000
Project Duration:	Two Years
Supported C2K Commitment(s):	By 2010, correct the nutrient and sediment related problems in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries sufficiently to remove the Bay and the tidal portions of its tributaries from the list of impaired water under the Clean Water Act.
Expected Methodology:	Current efficiencies for Ag & urban nonpoint source conservation practices were established independently by various technical workgroups. The Grantee <u>will not rely on those efforts</u> to evaluate pertinent research. However, the grantee is expected to use all relevant current and historic information in their analysis. Although the literature search should not be limited to North America, relevancy to mid-Atlantic physical and climatic conditions should be taken into account. If regional variations are likely, state reasoning and impact. If research practice descriptions do not match CBP descriptions, describe differences and the probable effect on efficiency. *It is strongly recommended that values be peer reviewed by an expert panel and their comments/recommendations addressed before the final report is submitted to the Chesapeake Bay Program. The use of a peer review panel and incorporation of panel recommendations are significant criteria evaluation factors.* Where research does not exist to suggest an efficiency value, an agreed-to value (best professional judgment) among qualified experts is acceptable. **Year One: Minimum Objective** Establish efficiency values and pre/post practice EOF N/P/S load values for new practices specified in Attachment 1. **Year Two: Objective** Complete remaining deliverables. **Attachment 1**: Definitions for current and New (proposed) practices. A list of current practices and efficiencies can be found on the Chesapeake Bay Program website at: ***www/chesapeakebay.net/tribtools.htm.***

Outputs And Deliverables:	**For <u>New</u> Conservation Practices**: Recommended efficiency value (or range), expressed as a percent reduction, for nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment for <u>each</u> *new practice* identified in Attachment 1. **For <u>Current</u> Conservation Practices**: Evaluate current efficiencies against available research (past & recent), recommend value (or range), expressed as a percent reduction, for nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment for <u>each</u> *currently tracked practice* identified in Attachment 1. When grantee recommendations differ from values currently used by CBP, a comparison and justification will be provided. **New/Current Practice Pre/Post Edge-of-Field (EOF) loads**: Where specified in Attachment 1, provide EOF values or range, expressed in load/acre, for nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment for <u>each</u> landuse associated with a specific practice. Identify portion coming from surface runoff and groundwater. **Practice Efficiency Confidence Interval**: Provide relative evaluation (rating) of the confidence interval for each recommended value for <u>*all*</u> practices in Attachment 1. Base interval on number of papers addressing subject, independent verification of value or range among papers and any other criteria determined by the grantee to be relevant in determining the final confidence interval. Rating should not be complicated, but should clearly identify the confidence one should place on the recommended values. Documentation should include criteria and evaluation process. The results of this independent analysis and set of recommended values will either collaborate or supersede values currently used in the CBP Watershed Model. **Year One Report**: Summary report of new conservation practice efficiencies and EOF values. Report will include the following components and support information. • Recommended value*, expressed as a percent reduction, for nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment for all new conservation practices listed under Part I in Attachment 1. • Edge-of-field (per acre) nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment load values* that describe the before/after impact of installation for practices listed in Attachment 1, Part 1. (<u>*Only for those specified.*</u>) • Complete description of the methodology used to develop final values, including evaluation process and criteria. • Bibliography of <u>all</u> literature reviewed. <u>*Copies*</u> of relevant literature (abstracts) used to derive recommended values. **Year Two (final) Report**: Summary report addressing remaining deliverables with supporting documentation. 1. Remaining conservation practice EOF/efficiency value summary report with the following components and support information. • Final recommended value, expressed as a percent reduction, for nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment for **each practice listed in Attachment 1, Parts I & II.** • Edge-of-field (per acre) nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment load values that describe

	the before/after impact of installation for **each practice listed in Attachment 1, Parts I & II.**. (*for those specified in Attachment 1*) • Complete description of the methodology used to develop final values, including evaluation process and criteria. • Bibliography of all literature reviewed. *Copies* (abstracts) of relevant literature used to derive recommended values. 2. Results of peer group discussions and recommendations. Include how comments were incorporated into final recommendations. 3. Confidence interval methodology, criteria and ranking process. 4. Full list of final recommended efficiency/EOF values. *It is likely that a peer review panel(s) would meet in year two after literature search and analysis activities were completed. Year One report can recommend interim values, that may change based on the recommendations/comments of an expert panel.
Environmental Results: **Expected Outcomes:**	All Basin jurisdictions have developed tributary strategies to reach assigned nutrient and sediment cap loads. Strategies include both traditional and new/innovative nutrient reduction activities (BMPs). Currently, science-based efficiency and pre/post edge-of-field values for new BMPs are not available. In addition, several currently used BMP efficiencies may require revision based on recent research or a more detailed analysis of past research. Appropriate nutrient reduction credit cannot be given until documented peer reviewed efficiency values are approved by the Program. This project will fill that information gap and provide the basis for nutrient and sediment reductions within the watershed model for annual progress reporting and future Watershed Model (WSM) scenarios used for establishing nutrient and sediment management options.
Additional Evaluation Criteria	The following additional criteria will be used to evaluate the suitability of proposals. • Expertise of PI and/or contributing authors to perform task. (Maximum score: 15 points) • Width & breath of proposed literature review and analysis. (Maximum score:10 points) • Use of outside peer review group(s) to collaborate recommended values. (Maximum score: 25 points)